

# New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1916

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 110 Broadway, New York. Editor: F. A. M. Smith. Business Manager: F. A. M. Smith. Telephone: 110 Broadway, New York.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES:** By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York: Daily \$3.00, 1 mo. \$1.00, 3 mos. \$2.50, 6 mos. \$4.50, 1 year \$8.00. Daily \$2.00, 1 mo. \$1.00, 3 mos. \$2.50, 6 mos. \$4.50, 1 year \$8.00. Sunday only \$1.00, 1 year \$10.00. Foreign \$5.00, 1 year \$50.00.

**FOREIGN RATES:** CANADIAN RATES: Daily \$3.00, 1 mo. \$1.00, 3 mos. \$2.50, 6 mos. \$4.50, 1 year \$8.00. Sunday only \$1.00, 1 year \$10.00. Foreign \$5.00, 1 year \$50.00.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute certainty—no if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

## The Candidates

The voters are to choose next Tuesday between nationalism and anti-nationalism—between real Americanism and a flabby sentimentalism which neglects American interests under the pretence of "serving mankind." They are also to choose between two candidates whose characters and methods offer an instructive contrast.

Mr. Wilson's most salient characteristic is instability. His mind does not work consistently; constancy is no part of his intellectual make-up. He is therefore never dependable. There is no expression of his on any political question made since he became President which cannot be controverted by an exactly contrary expression. He has done no single act as President which does not conflict with something else he has either said or done.

It would be tedious to enumerate all the questions on which he has been won on one side and now on the other. He has declared in favor of the broadest possible assertion of neutral rights on the high seas—even for the maintenance of principles of humanity beyond the scope of international law. But he has always, when pressed, narrowed his theoretical championship of neutral rights to cases in which American citizens alone were involved; and in practice he has seldom obtained any satisfaction whatever for the murder of Americans or for other violations of American rights.

He has protected American interests by force in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua, but has flatly refused to protect them in Mexico, although using force there for other purposes. He has been for and against the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, for and against the new doctrine of Pan-Americanism, for and against scuttling out of the Philippines, for and against the arbitration of labor disputes, for and against military preparedness, for and against woman suffrage, and still against the extension of the suffrage by constitutional amendment; for and against a tariff commission, for and against a single Presidential term, for and against economic preparation to meet the competition of Europe after the war.

Mr. Wilson's admirers say that he is eclectic—a pleasant word with which to cover up his inability to adhere to any convictions, to stick to any policy, to hew straight to any given line. Having this failing to an extraordinary degree, Mr. Wilson's statesmanship has been a jumble of theories, an orgy of contradictions. He has never thought ahead, never planned anything beyond a quick turn around the next corner. He has met in the same way all the troublesome situations which have arisen—by means of improvisations good for the moment only. He has dodged problems, but they have always come back. Then more legitimate solutions have been drawn out of a stage hat.

This might pass for statesmanship in quiet times—in the life of an Administration confronted by merely routine domestic problems. But Mr. Wilson's Administration has coincided with the greatest convulsion the world has ever known. He has poured out words copiously on the troubled waters. But words have been of no avail in a crisis when intense intellectual concentration, silent forethought and deadly earnestness were the qualities which ought to have dominated our national policy.

Only by a tenacious exhibition of those qualities could American interests be safeguarded. But Mr. Wilson talked, dallied, criss-crossed and muddled. His sentimental shilly-shallying ruined American prestige abroad. His sham Americanism has humiliated us and set us back in countless ways at home.

Mr. Hughes is a man of an entirely different stamp. He does not run riot with words. He is self-contained. He makes no promises which he does not intend to keep. He does not commit himself to policies which he expects to abandon whenever he thinks some temporary advantage is to be gained by abandoning them. He is intellectually constant and politically courageous.

When Mr. Hughes was Governor of New York he exhibited all the qualities which go to the making of

a trustworthy, dependable public man. He had strong convictions and followed them. He represented the progressive thought of the community. He pushed through many progressive laws—the Public Service Commission act, the workmen's compensation act, the acts reducing the hours of labor for women and children—which were accepted afterward as models by the legislatures of other states. He fought public gambling and wiped it out.

He was a staunch supporter of really progressive legislation. But he had no demagogic streak in him. He was not afraid to stand up, against pressure, for what he thought was fair and just. He vetoed the two-cent passenger rate law because he knew that it would work an injustice to the smaller railroads. He advised the Legislature to reject the income tax amendment to the Federal Constitution, not because he was opposed to the income tax, but because he felt that the amendment, as drawn, did not protect state and municipal bonds from taxation.

Mr. Hughes is a progressive statesman of the constructive type. He wants to build not for the moment, but for the future. His word is his bond. He is not profuse in promises, but any promises which he makes he will keep. He has pledged himself to maintain American rights at home, on the high seas and on foreign soil. He is pledged to protect American producers and American workmen from the disastrous effects of European competition after the war.

He stands for clear conceptions of rationalism and Americanism. He has the firmness of character, the tenacity of purpose and the intellectual grasp to put into practice the principles for which he stands in this campaign. And it is only by applying these principles that the United States can hope to recover its lost prestige abroad and to consolidate at home the fruits of its present prosperity.

As for the Vice-Presidential candidates, Mr. Fairbanks is a man of ripe experience and sound judgment. He would fill the office admirably, as he filled it from 1905 to 1909. Mr. Marshall is an eminent Chautauquan, given to loose and irresponsible talk—a near-humorist rather than a statesman. For the patriotic, self-respecting American there can be but one choice between the national tickets of the two parties.

## Conscience vs. Life

It was Mr. Gilbert Cannan who translated M. Romain Rolland's "Jean Christophe," and it is not to be wondered that both have chosen to occupy a similar relation to the war in their respective countries. Mr. Rolland is a voluntary exile at Geneva by reason of his efforts to limit French hatred of Germany and the Germans. Mr. Cannan defends the Conscientious Objectors of England and is caustically criticised for his effrontery.

Both men rank among the most interesting minds of the time. Why is it that both men, in an hour of tense tragedy for their nations, should so far alienate themselves from the current of contemporary thought as to deserve this portion of distrust? A correspondence in "The London Nation" furnishes some illumination. Mr. Cannan sought to defend those Englishmen who refused to fight by reason of conscientious scruple, and struck hard at the individual and governmental instinct which persecuted such exceptional souls. He remarked that "spiritual impulse is crushed in those who fight with their bodies by military discipline."

This attack brought a prompt response from an English writer who has been one of a very few literary men to find a true impulse toward art in the war, Mr. Hugh Walpole, author of "The Dark Forest." Said he in his letter of reply:

The bland egotism and presumption of such a conclusion drives me to wonder what Mr. Cannan has been doing during the last two years, where he has spent his time, and whether his absorption in his own spiritual adventures has allowed him the freedom to observe the records of others. His happy assurance of his own spiritual excellence should not lead him so readily to deny all spiritual impulse to those who, most unfortunately, no doubt, have opinions different from his own.

This criticism brought a prompt explanation from Mr. Cannan, in which he fervidly disclaimed any intention to detract from the glory of those who were fighting instead of objecting. His letter ran as follows:

Sympathy with the Conscientious Objectors does not detract in any way from the heroism of those who have fallen. They did what they believed, and deserve all honor, which they receive in full measure. The Conscientious Objectors are doing just as simply and just as bravely what they believe, and they deserve all honor; instead of which they receive injustice, excommunication, brutal and illegal punishment and incarceration. Mr. Walpole's friends believe that a military victory is possible. My friends believe that a moral victory is necessary.

That is the spirit of M. Rolland's plea since the start of the war—that no impulse to save one's country should be permitted to extinguish one's sense of charity toward one's enemies. The Frenchman had no Conscientious Objectors at home to deal with, so he sought to preserve some gleam of impartiality toward the Teutonic nations. Mr. Cannan's aim was to maintain a national attitude of fair play, or even sympathy,

toward the enemies at home, those Englishmen who for conscience sake refuse to fight.

We think Mr. Walpole was just in his detection of egotism and assurance. It is the frequent assertion of pacifists that the heroism of those who go to war is as nothing to the heroism of those who, against their nation's decision, refuse to fight. Perhaps. But such pleas as Mr. Cannan's do not stimulate this view. They stimulate rather the feeling that here we are dealing with not so much exalted prophets as abnormal malcontents who prefer the distinction of isolation to the general run of emotion.

We have no wish to generalize with respect to all Conscientious Objectors. We speak only of the reaction to such defence of conscience as Mr. Cannan puts forth. He seems not so much to speak for a thin band of pioneers flinging themselves beyond the firing line of common humanity in defence of a new and farseen cause as to fear at the general run of humanity reacting to the best of instincts it possesses. Any one who misses the ennobling impulse of sacrifice in the Great War is not so much blind as perverse. Taking Mr. Cannan as representative of the sort of conscience which he defends, we are bound to feel that what he is really upholding is a holier-than-thou, pharisaical pretence—not an ideal but an idol.

## Playing Politics with the Bench

Judge James A. Delehanty, of the Court of General Sessions, is a Democrat. Appointed by Governor Whitman to that post to fill an unexpected term in recognition of his excellent service as Assistant District Attorney, Judge Delehanty is a candidate for election for the full term of office. But he is not the Democratic candidate. He received the Republican nomination. He received the Progressive nomination. But Tammany Hall, having this unusual chance to make good on the frequent talk of its orators about "keeping the judiciary out of politics," nominated another man instead of this well-qualified Democrat.

The obvious inference is that Judge Delehanty is too good a judge to suit Tammany Hall. That means that he is precisely the man the voters should elect. He should be elected, first, because he is fit for the work and experienced in it; and, second, to rebuke a flagrant attempt to make political patronage of a judge's job.

Regarding Judge Delehanty's service, the Citizens Union recently said: "As law secretary and as Assistant District Attorney he enjoyed a training the value of which has been demonstrated since his elevation to the bench." A group of lawyers, among them men so well known in their profession as Horace E. Deming, Charles C. Burlingham, George L. Ingraham, Frank Moss, Howard Townsend, Almutz C. Vandiver, Julius Henry Cohen and Charles Albert Perkins, declares that Judge Delehanty's "record on the bench has been such as to win the admiration and approval of every friend of law, order and good government."

This is not the first time Tammany has flatly refused to cooperate with the Republicans in keeping the judiciary out of politics. It assuredly will not be the last, if the decent voters of New York County permit this attempt to play politics with the bench to succeed. A vote for Judge Delehanty means more than the retention in office of a good judge. It means keeping the ward-healers and the judges in widely separated spheres of influence—and that is a thing devoutly to be desired.

## Off-Shore Windjammers

No one would guess off-hand that the murder of an archduke in Serbia would mean much to the State of Maine, and specifically, that it would thrill the ancient and fading tribe of windjammers from stern to stern. Yet such is history. As Mr. Ralph D. Paine, in the current "Scribner's," expounds, the great war, with its high carrying rates, has awakened every seaport from Portland to Machias. Every last old fore-and-aft that could be kept afloat has been patched up and put overboard and the great yards of Bath and Camden have been working night and day to launch new keels.

It is a pleasant anecdote that describes one Andrew Robinson standing by the launching of his new craft at Gloucester in the year 1713 and overhearing a bystander exclaim in admiration: "There she scoons!" "Scooner let her be," said the builder; whence came the name of that famous breed. "Scoons" is a Cleydesdale word, meaning to glide, or slip free, and the Gloucester bysander may have meant the easy flowing lines of the first schooner as much as her new-fangled rig. But it is her rig, her many masts of fore and aft sails with never a crossyard from fore to mizzen, that has become her distinction. And that is proving a real handicap, it is safe to guess, on her present off-shore voyages. Her Yankee schooners are fast, fine wind-jammers for the headwind coasting work for which they were built. With the wind aft they are hard to steer and slow-moving by comparison with the square-riggers. Also, their huge sails are hard to shorten in a tight moment. Yet golden profits call and Yankee skippers have answered, and Maine schooners are taking the Stars and Stripes around a

large portion of the seven seas. The William P. Frye, for example, was bringing the American flag and a cargo of wheat from Seattle to Queenstown when she ended her days. Considered as a war bride the schooner ranks high. Mr. Paine tells of a retired skipper of Portland who put to sea in an old hulk costing \$17,000, which netted him \$35,000 in two voyages, after which he sold her for \$100,000—and retired to a catboat. The old shore craft still prevails in many of these craft and dividends have been fabulous. Will it last? Will the resurrected schooner trade survive the war? Bath doesn't know or care—how should any one, even a Yankee, when there are fools existent who will pay the full cost of your ship in a couple of voyages!

## DON QUIXOTE

### A Literary Figure Strangely Unsuitable to the Presidency

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I for the moment give Mr. Wilson the benefit of the doubt in regard to the Lusitania tragedy, and admit that in Mexico his main idea was right, though he made many mistakes in carrying it out. His condemnation lies in his attitude on the vital question of preparedness. His record need not be recapitulated here; every American voter knows that he let a year go by, denying any need of preparation; then he saw the tide was set overwhelmingly that way, and he trimmed to ride with it, following his usual custom of using strong resurgent words—and nothing doing.

Like Don Quixote, on this question he rode apparently in a world of dreams accompanied by his faithful Sancho Panza on a Democratic jackass, and on he rode, long featured, guileless, mounted on his rawboned steed, a weird light of idealism on his face, and his lance of rhetoric ready to thrust down the smoking throat of some monster forty-two centimetre cannon, while all the world wondered. All very well for a literary figure, but as President of the United States in the years of coming crisis that require a man who stands four square! Let us change the subject.

G. H. DE LA VERGNE.

New York, Nov. 2, 1916.

## Inconsistency

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Some of our "opposed-to-Wilson" friends, who abhor "class legislation," "lack of a strong, consistent American policy," "want of heroic patriotism," are unable to see their own inconsistency. One of them, speaking of the "straw votes" recorded at Liggett's and the Hotel McAlpin, said the latter was the real criterion, as the former voiced only the sentiment of the "mob," the "rabble." (Class alignment.) He objects to our form of government on the ground that the majority of our citizens ("the mob," the "rabble") are not competent to choose their rulers. (Strong Americanism.) Can a man who has this opinion of his fellow citizens and his government really develop any "heroic patriotism"? If so, for what or for whom? R. H. CANADAY.

New York, Nov. 2, 1916.

## Mr. Wilson Himself the Issue

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In a recent speech at Shadow Lawn President Wilson charged that the Republicans had abandoned all the issues put forward early in the campaign and had nothing to present now worthy of notice.

There has been in this campaign from the first but one issue of importance, and it stands out to-day as conspicuously as ever—that issue is Woodrow Wilson himself and his "too proud to fight" policy.

If the spirit of '76 was not dead that phrase "too proud to fight" alone would damn him in the mind of every true lover of his country and insure his defeat by an overwhelming majority. M. T. R.

New York, Nov. 2, 1916.

## One Pledge Kept

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I must protest against your asserting that President Wilson had broken the single term plank of the Democratic platform. This plank demanded an amendment to the Constitution "making the President of the United States ineligible for reelection." Mr. Wilson has made himself ineligible for reelection. READER.

New York, Nov. 2, 1916.

## Shadow Lawn Estimates

Our President, oh, he is bold, he's not afraid, you know, Of witches, warlocks, long-nosed things of things that are not "so." Now, Colonel, 'Tis easy scared, and as for Mr. Hughes, Why, when he sees a long-nosed thing he trembles in his shoes. But Bryan, Baker, Danies, ah! there is your valiant crew! With Mr. Wilson at the head with Mr. McAdoo. Let the long-nosed spook things come on just now and see if anybody in this squad is quaking. No, sir—e!

A feather bright and very white surmounts the Wilson hat; His step is firm, he always knows precisely where he's at. His old nurse taught him how to go forever straight ahead; He never turns except upon his other side in bed.

A constant man, a changeless man, twin to the northern star; Nothing can keep our President from keeping out of war. When Tipitids did his devil deeds did Mr. Wilson wince? Oh, no! He shook his fist and he's been shaking ever since.

Now, these are things that might be thought a trifle overdrawn, But they are largely in a speech pronounced at Shadow Lawn. The President said that he and his were firm and bold, but Hughes and those who followed that weak man were scared by bugaboos.

This is a serious world indeed; our way is in the dark; As we march on our little lives are full of care and dark. We should not always grinning be, and yet, once in a while, It is permissible to break into a gentle smile. E. D. BEACH.

## NATIONAL SPIRIT AT STAKE

### Republicans Should Rouse as They Did in Lincoln's Day.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The one great uncertainty that affects everything to-day is the great war. As in 1861, war threatens to invade our land. Whether it does or not, do we wish to have a Lincoln or a Buchanan at the helm of state? Shall we reward the man who, with a weak Cabinet, led our army and navy lapse into such inefficiency that he dared not lift up his voice at the proper time, when he might have prevented untold bloodshed in Europe and Mexico?

It is a terrible thing to contemplate the possibility, even probability, that the very man who seeks reelection by posing as the one preserver of peace in this country might have preserved the peace of the world if he had risen to the height of his opportunity and impersonated the indignation and horror of this country at the first threat to invade Belgium.

To the conscientious patriotic voter all propositions at a critical election resolve themselves into one appeal. What is right?

Is it right to play such "fantastic tricks" in the matter of Mexico as "make the angels weep" and the bloody-handed bandits grin?

Is it right, by weak diplomacy and hesitation to protect our countrymen, to so degrade America in the eyes of the world that no American man or woman is safe from insult in any country of the world? Is it right to play the great stakes of national honor and safety against mere dollars and votes?

Is it right to choose Cabinet officers and other officials of the weakness of Daniels, Baker and Bryan?

Shall we listen to the vociferations of 30,000 new office holders, "deserving Democrats," rather than to the revealing demand of the millions of Lincoln's plain people, who in this hour of peril demand the wisest statesman in the land? Shall we believe they have found him in Charles Evans Hughes, a man who resigned his great position to take his stand beside every laboring man on a platform of protection to American industry and the vindications of American honor before the world?

The times call for a man's man, a rugged, honest, clear-minded man who can speak plain words and not descend to dabble in rhetoric. The record of Mr. Hughes is so clear, his principles and his achievement so high, his analysis of our present problems so thorough and convincing, that it seems that he should already be as good as elected. It remains for every true man entitled to a vote to vote and get others to vote according to his conscience and not according to the smooth phrases spoken at the palace of Shadow Lawn by the sea. CHARLES H. CRANDALL.

Stamford, Conn., Oct. 31, 1916.

## Democratic Treatment of the Negro

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The Presidential election will be of peculiar interest to the 10,000,000 of negroes in this country, as it will present to them the question whether they want four years more of serfdom or whether they will strike the blow that will give to them the political prestige they have been robbed of under the Wilson rule. The negro stands to-day practically a political nonentity, stripped of every vestige of political manhood, little better than he was fifty years ago when he was given his freedom. Federal officers that he held under the Republican rule have been taken from him and given to white Democrats.

Precedents have been broken by sending to negro countries, notably Haiti, white men as United States ministers, many times over the protest of the natives.

Then came that infamous policy of "segregation" where negroes were shut off from their fellow employees. They were required to do effective work, screened off, in unsanitary places in the departments, without lights and other conveniences necessary to good work. All the little courtesies due all employees from their employer were ignored by the Wilson crew. Not content with this, infamous measures have been introduced in Congress and the Senate, all tending to set back the progress of the negro. The most flagrant of these was to introduce Jim Crow cars in the capital city.

In the last four years over twenty-five government positions, with salaries ranging from \$1,000 to \$5,000, have been taken from negroes who filled these offices creditably and with entire satisfaction.

The Republican party for years has recognized the political worth of the negro by rewarding his efforts. CLEVELAND G. ALLEN.

New York, Oct. 26, 1916.

## Retegression in Postoffices

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The Administration has been somewhat unfortunate in the management of the State, War and Navy departments at a time when international complications have required careful and efficient attention at Washington. However, one other department, most intimately associated with the everyday affairs of our own people, has suffered material retegression in personnel and efficiency. That is the Postoffice Department, over which Mr. Burleson, of Texas, has presided with economy at the expense of honor, justice and the sort of postal service we expect and demand.

Mails are being delayed, lost and destroyed. There is said to be more stealing than ever before. The service is poorly organized and undermanned. There is an enormous waste of time and money without any gain to the service.

P. M. G. Burleson and his assistants have done much to demoralize the postal service by exercising petty economies and resorting to actual persecution. Their idea of efficiency seems to be to get the greatest possible amount of work done by the fewest men and for the least money possible, incidentally requesting a substantial increase in their own salaries. Efficiency in the postal service cannot be obtained by that way. ONE WHO KNOWS.

New York, Nov. 2, 1916.

## The Employment Issue

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: But for the European war the Democrats could use the slogan "He kept us out of '14." For instance, the winter of 1913-'14. H. W. ARNOLD.

New York, Nov. 2, 1916.

## POLITICS AND MILITARY DECAY

### Guardsmen on the Mexican Border Are Disgusted with the Shabby Treatment They Feel They Have Received from the Authorities in Washington

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is refreshing to see in your columns still another dispatch from Washington, giving us the real truth regarding the low estate to which all our military forces have fallen, in that they are regulated not by military men, but by politicians. It is well known that, as far as military men are concerned, the withdrawal of the militia from the border and of Pershing's expedition from Mexico was approved and strongly recommended some months ago, but that the nearest of election and the fear of direct political consequences, resulting from any movement of troops whatsoever for other than political purposes has kept our long suffering Guardsmen doing constabulary work on the border, for which purpose they were never intended, and our column of regulars two hundred miles over the border in a foreign country, under conditions that are slowly but surely undermining the health of all the officers and men there.

All the hardships, discomforts and risks as to life and health can cheerfully be taken when there is a national emergency and a real need for such sacrifices. In his reply to Governor Whitman's letter, President Wilson stated that "the emergency which has arisen exists, and I am advised by the military authorities that the withdrawal of the militia at any time from the date of its original call up to and including the present would, in all human likelihood, have been followed by fresh aggressions from Mexico upon the lives and the property of the people of the United States."

The President is correct. There was an emergency last June—a national emergency—and this serious national emergency "still unhappily exists," but this emergency was not, and is not now on the border or in Northern Mexico. It is in Washington, and its principal features lie in the personal political fortunes of the commander in chief of the army of the United States and the clever politicians who comprise the members of his Cabinet and the members of Congress of his political faith.

I have been to the border, and I know whereof I speak when I say that the people of Texas, a state normally solidly Democratic, normally approving of anything done by a Democratic President simply because he is a Democrat, are simply disgusted with the President's sham and the political swindle that he has handed out to the patriotic members of the organized militia. The National Guard is now in a fair way to be disbanded, and it may be that this will be a good thing in the end, because it will bring us more rapidly to a real state of preparedness via the universal service route than would otherwise be the case.

But this is not the point. No such ulterior motive was intended by our

shortsighted "statesmen" in Washington at the time the Guard was called. They are simply abusing, for their own political ends, strictly state troops, called into Federal service "as such," in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, when no emergency and no necessity for that call, or at least for being retained so long in that service, really existed at all.

To prove the great power of politics in this whole matter, you have only to refer to the instance of the return of certain organizations from certain districts of certain states, where a careful watch was kept upon public opinion and full value placed upon the political consequences, favorable or otherwise, in regard to the return from or the retention on the border of that particular organization. We had a glaring example of it here in New York State in the case of the 3d Regiment, and this same rotten state of affairs exists in other cases with the active forces of states south of Mason and Dixon's line. Louisiana troops went to the border two months after the arrival there of Northern troops, simply to present a "clean bill of health" in answer to charges of sectionalism, and after four weeks of political maneuvering were returned, good Democrats all, to their home state in time to vote.

The statements of "Never again" and "I'm through" have a deeper significance than merely dissatisfaction with the medical conditions, or the climate, or the food, or the discomforts of active service, or the plain soldier's right to grumble. All the militiamen still on the border have been graduated beyond these amateur-soldier complaints. Their disgust comes from a realization of the mean, cheap and petty politics being played to-day by those in power in connection with the regular army and the National Guard of the United States; the unnecessary suffering caused their families, and in many cases the absolute ruin of their business careers; simply because of this politics playing at Washington; and finally, the usual American public apathy which considers its part done after it has waved goodbye to the last khaki-clad soldier for their part about his doings as long as the newspapers care to print the same on the front page.

So it is refreshing to read in The Tribune articles refuting Wilson's and Baker's statements as to what they did on the advice of "military authorities." At least 125,000 of the 150,000 Guardsmen who have been on the border have got this whole thing clear in their minds in the past few days, and read about his doings as long as the newspapers care to print the same on the front page.

NATIONAL GUARDSMAN.

New York, Oct. 20, 1916.

## CUTTING OFF MARKETS

### The Wilson Foreign Policy Would Keep Trade Seekers Home

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I have read with interest your editorial in to-day's issue about Mr. Wilson's violation of the Democratic platform of 1912 by failing to extend protection to American citizens residing or having property in any foreign country. You refer to the new Wilson doctrine that Americans who go to foreign countries to engage in trade are "adventurers" who put themselves beyond the protection of the flag, and you deprecate the effect which this policy, if continued, will have upon the Monroe Doctrine and our foreign relations. Strong and convincing as your editorial is, it seems to me you might well have placed a little more emphasis on the harm to our quest for foreign markets, and particularly for the markets of South America.

If after the war there is to be a general scramble among the nations for the markets of the world, it ought to be patent that those countries which, like England and Germany, protect the lives and property of their subjects abroad will have an advantage over the unprotected "adventurers" from the United States. The markets of South America have long languished before the nations of the world, and tens of thousands of American young men and women, thousands of them right here in New York City (as the language teachers will tell you), have been studying Spanish to prepare themselves for opportunities expected to come through the South American trade.

The subjects of a nation who go abroad to assist in the exploitation of undeveloped resources create markets for the manufacturers and producers at home. The long history of the British Empire and the more recent history of Germany afford the most convincing proof of this fact. By virtue of political ties, common ideals of government and geographical advantages the results of Europe that they cannot stay at home even when Europe is in the throes of the fiercest wars.

We are now enjoying a period of artificial and temporary prosperity caused solely by "war orders" from European nations. If we have another Wilson Administration, what will be the industrial condition after the war? Shall we encourage our young people to seek trade and wealth up markets for us in South America and other countries, or shall we encourage them to stay at home and eat the bread of charity when out of work, as thousands of workingmen, clerks, stenographers and shopgirls were compelled to do until the European war lifted the burden of industrial depression from the Wilson Administration? E. C. BILLINGS.

Brooklyn, Oct. 31, 1916.

## Gentle Judicial Sarcasm?

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In to-day's Tribune an account of the firing of Miss Jessie Ashley for distributing birth control information gives Justice McInerney's opinion. To quote: "I voted for the defendant's being sent to jail for thirty days. She merits the punishment. Those who break the laws ought to be punished. If they want to disseminate such information they ought to change the laws."

Bully for the justice! That is exactly what "they" wish to do, but, unfortunately, the great State of New York does not see fit that "they" should.

Is Justice McInerney really in favor of woman's suffrage—or is his opinion only gentle judicial sarcasm? JANE BALSAM.

New York, Oct. 31, 1916.

## DEMOCRATIC SHAMS

### Wilsonian Peace, Preparedness and Prosperity a Delusion and a Snare

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Peace, preparedness, prosperity—these three words are the slogans of the present Democratic national campaign. In New York an enormous shield bearing these three words is displayed outside the building in which the Democratic National Committee has its headquarters. Above them floats the American flag. Thus the Democrats are openly appealing to the people of the United States for votes on the claim that they have kept the country at peace, prepared against war and provided it with prosperity.

There never was a false claim. There never was a bolder attempt to obtain the Presidency by absolute misrepresentation and deception—such as they are waving the Stars and Stripes above it all!

We have not been kept at peace, and the foundation has been laid